17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

| 1 | | |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | | |
| | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 6 | FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 7 | TOR THE NORTHERN DIS | ICT OF CALIFORNIA |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | ETOPIA EVANS, ET AL., | |
| 10 | Plaintiffs, | No. C 16-01030 WHA |
| 11 | v. | |
| 12 | ARIZONA CARDINALS FOOTBALL | ORDER DENYING PRO HAC |
| 13 | CLUB, ET AL., | VICE APPLICATION OF ATTORNEY BENJAMIN BLOCK |
| 14 | Defendants/ | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | The pro hac vice application of Attorney Benjamin Block (Dkt. No. 42) is DENIED for | |

o hac vice application of Attorney Benjamin Block (Dkt. No. 42) is **DENIED** for failing to comply with Civil Local Rule 11-3. The local rule requires that an applicant certify that "he or she is an active member in good standing of the bar of a United States Court or of the highest court of another State or the District of Columbia, specifying such bar" (emphasis added). Filling out the pro hac vice form from the district court website such that it only identifies the state of bar membership — such as "the bar of Texas" — is inadequate under the local rule because it fails to identify a specific court (such as the Supreme Court of Texas). While the application fee does not need to be paid again, the application cannot be processed until a corrected form is submitted.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 29, 2016.

